DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 199 HE 000 184

By- Kerr, Clark

Higher Education in the Troubled City.

Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, Berkeley, Calif.
Pub Date 1 Apr 68
Note- 20p.; Lowell Lecture Series, Boston, Mass., April 1, 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10
Descriptors- College School Cooperation, Community Resources, Community Service Programs, *Curriculum Enrichment, *Equal Education, *Higher Education, Population Trends, School Expansion, *Site Selection, Urban Schools, *Urban Universities
Identifiers- *Urban Grant University

Demographers estimate the US population will zoom to 320 million by the year 2000, 85% of whom will concentrate in some 200 metropolitan areas. Large segments of the population already live in the cities, which suffer from problems that provide interested urban universities with opportunities for meaningful urban studies and programs. It is difficult to comprehend why, in the light of intellectual accomplishments, more colleges and universities have not directed efforts to their urban responsibilities. Some city college students have taken the initiative in establishing campus-community ties through various action programs. A new kind of institution, the urban-grant university, would support this student prescience and respond to critical urban needs. Equality of educational opportunity would become a reality, and campuses would be more accessible to urban students. The urban-grant university could also help area public schools improve curricula and textbooks, devise better integration methods, and provide tutoring and other activities to ease the transfer from high school to college in the interest of continuity of education. Services to the neighborhood would include health care, cultural activities, and research conducted in cooperation with community agencies. Extensive federal aid, as a response to direct applications from institutions, would be desirable. Funds could then be granted to all interested colleges and universities on the basis of merit and initiative. (WM)

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TROUBLED CITY

BY

CLARK KERR

Lowell Lecture Series
April 1, 1968

ED025199

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TROUBLED CITY

by Clark Kerr

Lowell Lecture Series
April 1, 1968

There are several reasons why the topic assigned to me tonight, "Higher Education in the Troubled City," is especially appropriate to this metropolitan area and this Lowell Lecture Series on Health in the Troubled City.

Let me quickly disclaim that Boston is a troubled city--or at least any more troubled than any other urban area in this nation in this decade. But it is a city with a long history of urban higher education, a city with the greatest array of colleges and universities of any other geographical area in the nation. Earlier it could fairly have been said that Boston, despite its rich resources of higher educational institutions, had perhaps the fewest or almost the fewest directed toward the problems of its own community and of the modern city. Now this is being rapidly changed, with the activities of Boston College, Boston University, the University of Massachusetts at Boston, Northeastern University, the Harvard-MIT Program, the Tufts-New England Medical Center, and other programs as well. And there is a great renaissance in the City of Boston itself. For three centuries we have looked to the Boston area for intellectual leadership, and now, as we face the urgent task of bringing more closely together the intellectual world and the problems of the cities, it is natural to expect that Boston will be the leadership city and that here will be the leadership colleges and universities in this great transformation.

The connections between higher education and the health problems of urban America are several. Higher education means upward mobility and better jobs for many individuals who otherwise would be condemned to a life of

ED025199

poverty and its attendant physical ills. Urban higher education offers a prospect for revitalizing the slum neighborhoods where new campuses may be built and for solving some of the desperate social and economic crises of the ghetto that contribute to the vicious cycle of poverty and sickness. More directly, higher education is the chief source of advances in knowledge in the health sciences, and of the training of health practitioners. Finally, its teaching hospitals and health care centers presently provide the most direct daily link between the university world and the world of the troubled city. Perhaps nowhere else in America is this connection between higher education and urban health more evident than here in Boston.

Reading the papers of those distinguished lecturers who have preceded me on this series, I am struck by how closely the crucial urban health problems seem to parallel those of urban higher education. Dr. Geiger spoke of the trap of sickness and poverty: without intervention, the poor get sicker and the sick get poorer. The same kind of cycle relates ignorance and poverty. In a world where constantly higher levels of skill and training are required for economic survival, the poor are ignorant and the ignorant get poorer. Dr. Geiger also cited the obvious links between health and race, and again we see the parallels with higher education and race: the minorities are far less likely to be either healthy or well-educated. Dr. Stewart spoke of the great need for equality of access to health care and of the barriers of geographic distance and cost that stand between health care and the people of the city cores. All these are equally as significant in the field of higher education. Dr. Somers described the spiraling costs of health care, and I found the topic, if not the precise figures, all too familiar. Mr. Field and others spoke of the need for new kinds of social institutions in urban health care. I am convinced higher education is equally in need of

new kinds of institutions and new approaches if it is to help solve the critical problems of urban America, and it is about these institutions and approaches that I should like to speak tonight.

The urban university in America is a relatively new phenomenon, with a few exceptions such as those in and close around Boston. The early American model came not from the great city universities of continental Europe but from Oxford and Cambridge. The rural tradition in higher education had other roots as well. One was the view of some of the early Protestant churches that young people were better schooled in a rural atmosphere, safe from the city's evils. Another was the tendency of every small but aspiring community to establish what Professor Boorstin of Chicago has called a "booster" college--a little college set up by the local booster group. And finally the land-grant movement served to strengthen and institutionalize the universities' ties to rural life.

Today we are a great urban nation, but most of our universities and colleges have not yet made an adequate adjustment for life in urban society. Many of them cling to their secluded pastoral settings and view prospective metropolitan locations with an aversion that is curious in the light of the history of intellectual accomplishment. As San Francisco's longshoreman and resident philosopher Eric Hoffer commented in his characteristic style just last month,

> Not a single human achievement was conceived or realized in the bracing atmosphere of steppes, forests or mountain tops. Everything was conceived and realized in the crowded, stinking little cities of Jerusalem, Athens, Florence, Shakespeare's London, Rembrant's Amsterdam. The villages, the suburbs, are for the dropouts . . . . we will decay, we will decline if we can't make our cities viable. That's where America's destiny will be decided--in the cities.

Many of our colleges and universities today are in urban locations perforce rather than by choice, either because the city grew up around them or

because they were started with municipal or other urban-based funds and never quite managed to move away from the urban environment they now tolerate but never embrace. There has been in this country since 1914 an Association of Urban Universities, made up of institutions who by virtue of location or funding or source of students or the establishment of a department or institute of urban studies are considered urban institutions. Some have undertaken urban renewal projects in their immediate neighborhoods for the sake of their own students and faculty. Yet few of these institutions until very recent years have really faced up to the full opportunities and responsibilities of their urban associations.

America's population today is in the cities, and this will increasingly be the case. By the year 2000, demographers estimate that there will be 320 million people in the United States and that 85 percent of the total will be concentrated in some 200 metropolitan areas. America's problems today are in the cities--problems of race, problems of poverty, problems of administration, problems of physical environment. American higher education today is on the brink of a very great transformation--a transformation to put it where the population is, where the need is, where the opportunity is--in short, "where the action is."

I might note that many of America's students are already flocking to the big city campuses and, once there, are fanning out into the city neighborhoods to engage in a broad array of community action projects such as those which Harvard students conduct under the coordination of the Phillips Brooks House Association--tutoring, work in mental hospitals, the Roxbury Education Program, and others. One observer I know has stated that Harvard's greatest impact upon the community is probably through its students, and the same could be said of many other campuses today. As Dr. Liveright of Boston University

said at one of that institution's distinguished Metroseminars, it is time for our universities to catch up with and support the students, who have taken the great initiative in building real ties between the campus and the inner city.

To give the necessary impetus to this great transformation of higher education, I believe we need some essentially new kinds of institutions, different from both our traditional rural universities and most of our so-called urban universities. What I propose is a new university model, which I am calling the urban-grant university to suggest a deliberate parallel with the land-grant university of the last century.

The land-grant university was also a new institutional form, which turned away from the model of the classical university in order to meet new needs in a changing society. It received its initiative and support from federal funds, and I propose that federal funds should now be put into the urban-grant universities. Above all, it assumed a sense of broad responsibility for the quality of rural life in its state, and I think today we urgently need to have a number of universities with a similar sense of responsibility for the qualify of life in their urban areas. We will need to reorient some of our established institutions; we will need to establish new urban branches and activities for the older universities; we will need to create entirely new institutions. To meet the enrollment demands of the next decade, the United States is going to have to build a great many new colleges and universities--perhaps as many as fifty a year, which is one a week. I would urge that some of these be urban-grant institutions, directly responsive to the crucial needs of the cities.

One of the most immediate and urgent needs is to make higher education equally accessible to all parts of our society. Equality of educational

opportunity is not the case today. We have, particularly in our cities, what Gunnar Myrdal calls an "underclass", and we are not yet reaching that underclass. For example, only half as many Negroes go to a college or university today as is true of the population as a whole, and half of that one-half go to completely segregated Negro colleges and universities. The situation for the Puerto Ricans, and for the Mexican Americans--as we know so well in California--is even worse in many places. These people are separated from the world of learning by barriers of geographic distance, cost, earlier school preparation, motivation, sometimes even the most basic lack of familiarity with the advantages of a college education. We cannot wait for them to come to us. It is now time--and past time--for us to go to them, for our sake as much as for theirs. U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe has put the challenge and the opportunity with singular eloquence:

> Think what could happen in this country if 70 percent of the youngsters from our most disadvantaged neighborhoods went to college. What a revolution! For our middle-class youngsters, college is, by and large, more of the same. For ghetto youngsters it is a dramatic change, the discovery of the possible--not a plateau but a peak, not a view but a vista. Symbolically (if not always actually) college is for them the elimination of restrictions on opportunity, the opening at the end of the tunnel of generations.

Beyond assuring equality of educational opportunity to all citizens, the American university has another positive obligation of great social significance--the search for talent. Ours is a meritocracy--a society based on merit rather than on inherited status or economic class or political ideology. In such a society the university must assume the prime responsibility for finding and training the talented individuals. The training part of that mission has been accomplished with tremendous success. Now, for the continued well-being of our society, the university must intensify and broaden the initial search for talent, especially among the presently-untapped sources of the inner city and the minorities.

The urban-grant university can locate in the inner city, at once removing the barrier of geographic distance and helping to bring about a familiarity with its existence, its purposes and its activities. It might be able to use a run-down area already slated for urban renewal. It might locate adjacent to or in air space over a central rapid transit station, to enhance its accessibility to a larger city area. Whatever its precise location, careful planning and design can greatly add to the sense of accessibility and community-oriented concern. High-rise design and minimal land surface use will keep neighborhood displacement as low as possible--in this connection I note the brilliant land use of the Tufts-New England Medical Center, limited to what I understand is an almost-unbelievable fourteen acres, including a number of community amenities. We need to experiment with street-level developments that are as open and public and inviting as possible, to attract and even lure the neighborhood into campus contact. Why could not the urban campuses, for example, include street-level cafeterias, libraries, bookstores and displays completely open to the public as well as staff and students? To replace the university's medieval walls, we now need to build pathways to our doors.

Admissions policies should be re-examined so as to remove as many academic barriers as possible. At the University of California we have experimented with waiving the usual very high admissions requirements for a small number of disadvantaged students who appear to have high motivation but inadequate formal preparation, and we have found that they do remarkably well--better than some of our regularly-admitted students. Other universities are making the same discovery. It is possible that a combination of high motivation and some academic counselling and assistance along the way can make up for a much greater lack of formal academic work than we have heretofore suspected.

I find that many faculty members today are eager to meet the challenge of teaching these disadvantaged students and feel confident that they can. The faculty members have no intention of lowering the quality of the final product that comes out of the college. Rather, by greater attention and greater concern, they intend to help make up for the deficiencies of the earlier years.

A more direct attack on the problem is to do away with these deficiencies in the first instance. For a long time our universities have focussed upon providing the best possible education to the students who could meet the high admission standards--and this best has become very good indeed. But the university has not spent much of its time looking beyond its boundaries to see why other individuals were not being sufficiently motivated and prepared. The University must now accept the same challenge that Dr. Stewart in his lecture issued to the medical center: to dare to extend itself beyond its traditional island of responsibility. The urban-grant university should extend its responsibility to the entire public school system of its urban area. It should offer to help with improving the curriculum and the text books, with devising better patterns of integration, with identifying and counselling students of great potential who have not seriously considered the prospect of higher education. Some cities are moving toward the establishment of large educational parks, to meet problems of de facto segregation and to allow other improvements in our grammar and high schools. Perhaps an urban-grant university might serve as the center for such an educational park, its very location symbolizing to the students from their early school days that the university is a normal and expected extension of their regular educational experience. There might then be special university programs for high school students, provision for tutoring by college students, and other

opportunities for building bridges from the high school to the immediately-adjacent university.

The urban-grant university might also experiment with better adapting its calendar and curriculum to the particular needs of the disadvantaged students who do succeed in reaching its doors. Heretofore, the emphasis has been primarily on adjusting the student to university life; perhaps, now, we must move more in the direction of adjusting the university program to the new realities of present-day student circumstances. As President W. R. Keast of Wayne State University has pointed out:

> Complex as our modern universities are, they define a rather limited number of tracks along which a person can move into American society. Most of the tracks assume backgrounds and experiences of kinds by no means typical of much of our city youth. We should experiment with a larger number of tracks.

For example, it will probably be necessary for many of these students to work at least part-time. Academic schedules should be as flexible as possible, evening classes available whenever the demand is great enough, necessary interruption and resumption of studies accepted without penalties, maximum use made of work-study programs, independent study, and computerized instruction where students can proceed at their own pace in whatever time they have available. The rule should be that academic work, however intermittent, is of great value to the student and to society, even though it may be inconvenient for the university.

Every measure should be taken, however, to encourage the commuter student and the part-time student to be active members of the campus intellectual and cultural community. This means providing locker space, study facilities, informal dining and lounge areas so that these students will want to spend as much time in the campus environment as their schedules will allow.

I think it is clear that the challenges of extending higher education to new groups of students will force us to re-examine many of our old concepts of student-university relationships. We used to think the transfer from high school to university should represent a real break, a jolt to make students sharply aware of the need for new attitudes and a new maturity. Now we may have to ease the transfer in every way in the more urgent interests of continuity of education. We used to encourage full-time attendance and penalize frequent interruptions and intermittent study to encourage academic discipline among middle-class students who could usually afford to be full-time scholars. Now we may have to acknowledge and adapt to the economic priorities that require part-time schedules and protracted degree progress. We used to encourage campus residence and a wide array of extra-curricular activities to enrich the college experience. Now we may have to accept the commuter student as the norm, give up most campus activities because of urban space limitations, and instead find our student activities among the rich diversity that the surrounding city community has to offer.

Beyond serving new groups of students to whom higher education might otherwise be inaccessible, the urban-grant university can aid the city in other important ways. One is in the area of health care, as I mentioned earlier. I won't go into details about the various ways in which university medical schools and teaching hospitals can extend their services to broad urban areas; several other speakers on this series have already outlined the extremely promising and exciting possibilities in university-sponsored health services to the cities--and you in the Boston area are already seeing some of the actualities.

The urban-grant university can help in a number of ways to support and enrich the cultural activities of the city. Civic cultural enterprises often

operate on very narrow financial margins, and permanent university support may be one way of assuring their continuity. I understand, for example, that Cornell University is considering a twenty-year arrangement with the Ithaca Festival Center providing for University support in exchange for cooperative use of the facilities. I believe Indiana and Purdue are undertaking a similar arrangement with the Fort Wayne Art Center. This kind of cooperation, rather than competition and the duplication of expensive facilities, should prove a boon to both the urban university and the city.

As a result of its location in a large population center rather than in a small town or rural setting, the urban-grant university is ideally located to provide the kind of post-graduate, continuing education that is increasingly important today. In most professions--the health sciences, law, education, engineering, and others--and in many of the sciences, refresher courses and other kinds of continuing education programs are now essential. As Sir Eric Ashby remarked recently:

> . . . the university of tomorrow will constantly be bringing graduates back for retraining; indeed . . . we may come to regard a university degree as we do a passport: it will expire every ten years unless renewed.

Finally, the urban-grant university can serve its urban area by turning its research attention to the many difficult and complex problems that beset our cities. Like its land-grant counterpart, the urban-grant university should assume active responsibility for seeking out new knowledge to help solve the problems of its community and for working in close conjunction with community agencies to apply that knowledge to best effect.

I am well aware, of course, that there will be strong areas of resistance to some of these new functions, concepts, and orientations. As President of the University of California, I was engaged in planning for two new urban

campuses, one in San Francisco, and one in downtown Los Angeles or possibly even in Watts, plans that I am sorry to say have been put aside. It was in working on these plans that I became familiar with some of the kinds of resistance to new urban institutions.

One concern, particularly among some faculty members, is about the quality and standards of the urban university. There is a strange conviction prevalent among some faculty members that work on local city problems is of lower quality than work on problems of the nation or of some other part of the world. I would note that the land-grant universities a century ago started out with similar concerns over whether study and research on the problems of their agricultural areas could be of high academic quality. These institutions did develop high academic quality, of course. Today, one-third of all Ph.D. degrees in the United States are awarded by land-grant universities, and the rate is one-half of all Ph.D. degrees in the biological sciences and the health sciences. This example should demonstrate that the fear about low quality is not well-founded, but it continues to exist.

Another source of resistance, particularly among university administrators and trustees, is the fear of controversy. When one engages in a study of population controls in India, that controversy is a long way away. When one studies a difficult problem in his own community, the controversy is immediate and intense. The land-grant institution did not face this degree of controversy; by and large, it was dealing with a single interest group and was inclined to go along with the needs and wishes of that group. There were and are occasional problems--you may recall the professor in Iowa who had a few good words to say about oleomargarine. But these controversies have been nothing like what an urban institution is likely to face, given the urgent nature of urban problems today and the many conflicting points of view represented in the cities.

The city fathers have their hesitations too. There are financial concerns--what happens to urban revenue sources as more land is taken off the tax rolls? There are concerns related to the nature of today's students and the tensions in the inner city--is it potentially dangerous to put together, in San Francisco or in Los Angeles or in Detroit or elsewhere, an explosive student generation and the people of the ghetto? There may also be fears that the university's participation in civic problems will interfere with and upset the municipal bureaucracy.

I recognize that these are important questions, and that there are no easy solutions to some of them. But I am deeply convinced that the needs today are so great that they must overwhelm the doubts as well as the problems. The challenge to bring new groups of students into the academic mainstream and to apply new knowledge, new ideas, and new services to the problems of the city is so tremendous that I believe we must now move ahead despite the doubts.

And we will find many important sources of support upon which to build. One is the students who, as I indicated earlier, are taking the lead in reaching out to those who so desperately need help. It is important, of course, that the urban-grant university attract substantial numbers of students from outside as well as within the city core, so that it does not become as segregated as its rural counterpart. The indications today are that students from all sections of the country are interested in the urban institutions with their opportunities for service and for a diversified range of nearby cultural, political, and professional activities. As these students carry their interests into future careers in the city or in the university itself, they will help to strengthen the ties between the new urban campus and the urban community.

There is already some faculty support, and I think increasing numbers of faculty members will be willing to participate once they are reassured about the academic standards that should mark the urban-grant university. We need to make clear that new concepts and approaches do not mean lower standards, and that an urban-grant institution is first of all a university. It will offer a full complement of academic disciplines and professions, and maintain the traditional research standards of objectivity in the pursuit of truth. Its focus on the problems and opportunities of the city will have a stimulating impact on all the academic areas, just as agriculture and engineering stimulated and enriched the curricula of the land-grant institutions. The spreading impact of the urban focus throughout the entire university is reflected in the new Council on Urban Affairs just established by the University of Illinois. Composed of representatives of all major units within the University, the Council will assist the Center for Urban Studies at the Chicago Circle campus and will coordinate planning on all campuses for programs of instruction, research, and public service in the urban field. Chancellor Klotsche of the Milwaukee campus of the University of Wisconsin, a leading urban educator, emphasizes that

> The city is the place where the rich materials needed by the student and by the faculty member are available. This is where the museums are, this is where the art galleries are, the halls of music, the playhouses, the libraries and so on. This is where the social scientist can find real problems, where the medical student can find a wide variety of clinical materials for his experience, where the engineering student and scholar can relate themselves to all of the dramatic developments that are taking place in modern science and technology and in the industrial development characteristic of our urban society.

University administrators will, I believe, rise to the challenge if they can be assured that the institutions will not be subject to crippling amounts of controversy. To meet this problem, we shall have to cultivate a

considerable amount of public understanding of a university's role--especially understanding of the distinction between service based on disinterested applications of knowledge and positions taken because of partisan politics. And the urban-grant institutions--and indeed all universities today--will need strong and socially responsible boards of trustees who can stand as buffers between campus and community. The trustees should be selected on a non-political basis, should be chosen with great care for their understanding of the values of higher education as well as their appreciation of community problems, and should be made aware of their responsibility to protect the freedom of the institution rather than to intensify the external pressures.

The support of the inner city inhabitants--the new neighbors of the institution--will also be very important to the success of the enterprise. That support should not be taken for granted. If the people of the community are not fully consulted and informed of institutional plans, if they do not believe they will stand to gain visible and important benefits in exchange for some upheaval of their neighborhoods, the results can be catastrophic--as the Newark medical school example so clearly demonstrates. Another illuminating incident was the protest last fall of a group of Roxbury citizens that the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies was receiving large Ford Foundation grants for professorial chairs but was sponsoring few action programs for the community--and that these grants were examples of the universities profiting from the problems of the ghetto. The community inhabitants need to be convinced that the urban-grant university is working for community as well as university goals, and that they are not merely guinea pigs for experimental research with no practical results. It is especially through health care programs that the local citizens can realize

clear and immediate benefits from the urban-grant institutions. Mr. Field, at one of the Boston University Metroseminar discussions, described the new outlook of the medical schools in terms that might well be adopted for the whole urban-grant university:

> In the teaching medical center, it used to be fashionable to think of a three-legged stool of teaching, research, and service. A more stable design is emerging, a four-legged one with community involvement as that fourth leg.

Municipal leaders are increasingly recognizing that the potential benefits of higher education to the cities far outweigh the financial and other problems that city campuses may bring. Witness the support which Mayor Daley of Chicago has given the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois, and the cooperation that former Mayor Collins and now Mayor White are giving to the many college and university programs here in Boston. Mayor Collins in 1966 said of our universities and scholars that

> . . . they have made a fantastically great contribution to scientific advancement and to the growth of our industrial know-how. However, they have made precious little contribution to the improvement of our urban environment, and it's perhaps because they have not been invited into the middle of the battle. I think that all of us should be making certain that the invitation is extended and clearly understood, because I can tell you that if this job is left to municipal administrators and elected officials on a local level alone, without the involvement of the intellectual segment of our society, then this job cannot be done adequately.

All these sources of support--students, faculty, administrators, city fathers, the community itself--are invaluable. But the most crucial support must come in the form of massive federal aid. The costs of all higher education, urban or otherwise, are constantly rising today as greater proportions of students enter college, more continue into the costlier graduate and professional programs, faculty salaries are rising after lagging in earlier times, and the average quality of institutions across the nation is improving. The cities and the states with their less elastic tax bases

cannot continue to support higher education without help. The federal government is the one segment of society whose income rises faster than the gross national product and which is therefore in a position to meet the needs of higher education for a larger share of our national resources. I think over the next few years we will see the federal government supporting higher education in a much more basic way than it has ever done before, and I would hope that a very significant share of that support will be channeled into urban-grant university programs.

There are, of course, a number of precedents for such extensive federal aid. In fact, the history of federal aid to education in the United States is a history of federal response through the colleges and universities to some of the great problems of the nation. The federally-initiated land-grant university movement was responsive to agrarian needs and to problems of national economic expansion. During and after World War II, the federal government and the nation's universities entered a broad cooperative endeavor to expand and improve science training and research. In the postwar years federal government financed the college attendance of the returning war veterans, thus launching the tremendous enrollment expansion that has continued to this day. Then, as people became increasingly concerned with our community health problems, the government began providing substantial sums for medical schools and for health research.

Now we are confronted with serious national problems in making equality of opportunity a reality, in improving the quality of life in our cities, and in providing for the continuing expansion of our colleges and universities. I believe it is entirely logical for the federal government to respond to these problems by undertaking massive levels of federal aid to colleges and universities across the nation but particularly in our metropolitan areas.

There is one respect in which I think the urban-grant university should specifically depart from the land-grant model. Rather than a system of selection of institutions by the state governments, I would much prefer to see a system of direct institutional applications to and grants from the federal government. These applications could be submitted by public or private institutions, by existing rural or suburban colleges willing to launch new urban campuses or new activities relating to urban problems, by existing urban colleges for expansion and reorientation of their programs, or by public agencies or private groups proposing to establish entirely new institutions. In this way the private "prestige" institutions of the country could participate along with leading state universities and other types of colleges. Support would be given on the basis of merit and initiative, rather than merely by automatic geographical distribution among the states. The participation of some prestige institutions, both public and private, I believe to be highly important to the initial success of the urban-grant movement.

In making these proposals, I have not meant to imply that the city and its people would be the sole beneficiaries or that the universities should act solely out of altruistic motives. Actually, I think the universities can reap valuable rewards from their new relationships to the city. In addition to broadening and enriching both their curricula and their research programs, the urban institutions stand to make important gains in public support and political strength. The state of California, which I know best, has seen historically how the University of California has gained strength through its contact with agriculture. But now agriculture is fast-declining in relative importance. How can the University of California maintain its close contact with society when there is no longer the connection with the

people in the rural areas and their legislators? It seems to me that by moving into the cities and helping to meet their needs, helping to get better schools and better health care and better opportunities for minority groups, our colleges and universities can substantially broaden their bases of public support and political strength. A number of the great universities of the present day rose to distinction on the land-grant idea, and my prediction is that some of the universities of the next half-century or century will have risen to greatness on the strength of their relations to their surrounding urban communities.

Another strong proponent of urban higher education, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., has said:

> . . . in this turbulent time ahead, the urban university, as the new and growing element in the American system of higher education, becomes a critical sector in the struggle for civilized life in America. More and more young men and women each year will look to it as the means of entry into the world of work and opportunity . . . . On the nation falls the obligation to strengthen the city university so that it can meet its responsibilities to generations yet to come.

We in higher education can hang back from the challenge, or we can welcome the opportunity. If we step forward, higher education can play a central role in developing our cities as the great centers of our civilization. Our land-grant universities made agriculture in the United States the most productive in the world. I am convinced that urban-grant universities could make our cities among the most effective in the world, economically, politically, culturally--as environments for human beings to live their lives in. The opportunity is here and now for higher education to meet the great challenge of our times.